

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application is requested in view of the remarks that follow.

Since this response has been filed within two months after the October 6, 2003, Final Rejection in this application, a timely Advisory Action is requested.

In the October 6, 2003 Final Rejection, the Examiner rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Parks '251 patent in view of the Kume et al. '098 patent. Claims 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Parks '251 patent in view of the Kume et al. '098 patent and the Crawford et al. '063 patent.

As indicated above, claims 15-18 have been cancelled. New claims 19-22 have been added. For the reasons set forth below, it is believed that new claims 19-22 patentably distinguish over the cited references, whether considered individual or in combination.

Specifically, new independent claim 19 recites an apparatus that includes an array of pixel cells for a light valve that comprises an array of pixel cells arranged in a checkerboard pattern having a first set of squares that alternates with a second set of squares such that pixel cells in the first set of squares are diagonally adjacent pixel cells in the second set of squares. Diagonally adjacent pixel cells have a gap formed therebetween that includes a first edge defined by a pixel cell from the first set of squares and a second edge defined by a pixel cell from the second set of squares; the first and second edges are parallel. A dielectric spacer structure intervenes in the gaps between the first set of squares and the second set of squares. Further, as recited in new claim 19, structure projects over a substantial portion of the dielectric spacer structures to shield the dielectric spacer structures from incident light.

Upon review of the Parks '251 patent, the Kume et al. '098 patent, and the Crawford et al. '063 patent, it is submitted that none of these references teach structure projecting over dielectric spacer structures between adjacent sets of pixel cells to shield the dielectric spacer structures from incident light. Furthermore, it is submitted that nothing in any of these three


references, whether considered individually or in combination, either teaches or suggests such structure for shielding the dielectric spacer structures from incident light.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant believes that all claims currently pending in this application patentably distinguish over the prior art. Therefore, it is requested that this amendment be entered and that the application be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

STALLMAN & POLLOCK LLP

Dated: December 5, 2003

By:   
Michael J. Pollock  
Reg. No. 29,098

Attorneys for Applicant(s)